A Universal upper bound on Graph Diameter based on Laplacian Eigenvalues

Shayan Oveis Gharan^{*} Luca Trevisan[†]

Abstract

We prove that the diameter of any unweighted connected graph G is $O(k \log n/\lambda_k)$, for any $k \geq 2$. Here, λ_k is the k smallest eigenvalue of the normalized laplacian of G. This solves a problem posed by Gil Kalai.

1 Introduction

Let G = (V, E) be a connected, undirected and unweighted graph, and let d(v) be the degree of vertex v in G. Let D be the diagonal matrix of vertex degrees and A be the adjacency matrix of G. The normalized laplacian of G is the matrix $\mathcal{L} = I - D^{-1/2}AD^{-1/2}$, where I is the identity matrix. The matrix \mathcal{L} is positive semi-definite. Let

$$0 = \lambda_1 \le \lambda_2 \le \ldots \le \lambda_n \le 2$$

be the eigenvalues of \mathcal{L} . For any pair of vertices $u, v \in G$, we define their distance, dist(u, v), to be the length of the shortest path connecting u to v. The diameter of the graph G is the maximum distance between all pairs of vertices, i.e.,

$$\operatorname{diam}(G) := \max_{u,v} \operatorname{dist}(u,v).$$

The following question is asked by Gil Kalai in a personal communication [Kal12]. Is it true that for any connected graph G, and any $k \ge 2$, diam $(G) = O(k \log(n)/\lambda_k)$. We remark that for k = 2, the conjecture is already known to hold, since the mixing time of the lazy random walk on G is $O(\log n/\lambda_2)$. Therefore, this conjecture can be seen as a generalization of the k = 2 case.

In this short note we answer his question affirmatively and we prove the following theorem

Theorem 1.1. For any unweighted, connected graph G, and any $k \ge 2$,

$$\operatorname{diam}(G) \le \frac{48k \log n}{\lambda_k}$$

^{*}Department of Management Science and Engineering, Stanford University. Supported by a Stanford Graduate Fellowship. Email:shayan@stanford.edu.

[†]Department of Computer Science, Stanford University. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under grant No. CCF 1017403. Email:trevisan@stanford.edu.

Our proof uses the easy direction of the higher order cheeger inequalities (see e.g. [LOT12]). For a set $S \subseteq V$, let $E(S,\overline{S}) := \{\{u,v\} : |\{u,v\} \cap S| = 1\}$ be the set of edges with exactly one endpoint in S, and let N(S) be the set of neighbors of the set S. Let $vol(S) := \sum_{v \in S} d(v)$ be the volume of the set S, and let

$$\phi(S) := \frac{|E(S,S)|}{\min\{\operatorname{vol}(S), \operatorname{vol}(\overline{S})\}}$$

be the conductance of S.

Let $\phi_k(G)$ be the worst conductance of any k disjoint subsets of V, i.e.,

$$\phi_k(G) := \min_{\text{disjoint } S_1, S_2, \dots, S_k} \max_{1 \le i \le k} \phi(S_i).$$

The following theorem is proved in [LOT12]; it shows that for any graph G, $\phi_k(G)$ is well characterized by the λ_k .

Theorem 1.2 (Lee et al.[LOT12]). For any graph G, and any $k \ge 2$,

$$\frac{\lambda_k}{2} \le \phi_k(G) \le O(k^2) \sqrt{\lambda_k}.$$

We use the left side of the above inequality (a.k.a. easy direction of higher order cheeger inequality) to prove Theorem 1.1.

2 Proof

In this section we prove Theorem 1.1. We construct k disjoint sets S_1, \ldots, S_k such that for each $1 \le i \le k$, $\phi(S_i) \le O(k \log n / \operatorname{diam}(G))$, and then we use Theorem 1.2 to prove the theorem.

First, we find k + 1 vertices $v_0, ..., v_k$ such that the distance between each pair of the vertices is at least diam(G)/2k. We can do that by taking the vertices v_0 and v_k to be at distance diam(G). Then, we consider a shortest path connecting v_0 to v_k and take equally spaced vertices on that path.

For a set $S \subseteq V$, and radius $r \ge 0$ let

$$B(S,r) := \{v: \min_{u \in S} \operatorname{dist}(v,u) \le r\}$$

be the set of vertices at distance at most r from the set S. If $S = \{v\}$ is a single vertex, we abuse notation and use B(v,r) to denote the ball of radius r around v. For each $i = 0, \ldots, k$, consider the ball of radius diam(G)/6k centered at v_i , and note that all these balls are disjoint. Therefore, at most one of them can have a volume of at least vol(V)/2. Remove that ball from consideration, if present. So, maybe after renaming, we have k vertices v_1, \ldots, v_k such that the balls of radius diam(G)/6k around them, $B(v_1, \operatorname{diam}(G)/6k), \ldots, B(v_k, \operatorname{diam}(G)/6k)$, are all disjoint and all contain at most a mass of vol(V)/2.

The next claim shows that for any vertex v_i there exists a radius $r_i < \operatorname{diam}(G)/6k$ such that $\phi(B(v_i, r_i)) \leq 24k \log n / \operatorname{diam}(G)$.

Claim 2.1. For any vertex $v \in V$ and r > 0, if $vol(B(v,r)) \le vol(V)/2$, then for some $0 \le i < r$, $\phi(B(v,i)) = 4 \log n/r$.

Proof. First observe that for any set $S \subseteq V$, with $\operatorname{vol}(S) \leq \operatorname{vol}(V)/2$,

$$\operatorname{vol}(B(S,1)) = \operatorname{vol}(S) + \operatorname{vol}(N(S)) \ge \operatorname{vol}(S) + |E(S,\overline{S})| = \operatorname{vol}(S)(1 + \phi(S)) \tag{1}$$

where the inequality follows from the fact that each edge $\{u, v\} \in E(S, \overline{S})$ has exactly one endpoint in N(S), and the last equality follows from the fact that $\operatorname{vol}(S) \leq \operatorname{vol}(V)/2$. Now, since $B(v, r) \leq \operatorname{vol}(V)/2$, by repeated application of (1) we get,

$$\operatorname{vol}(B(v,r)) \ge \operatorname{vol}(B(v,r-1))(1 + \phi(B(v,r-1))) \ge \dots \ge \prod_{i=0}^{r-1} (1 + \phi(B(v,i)))$$
$$\ge \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \phi(B(v,i))\right)$$

where the last inequality uses the fact that $\phi(S) \leq 1$ for any set $S \subseteq V$. Since G is unweighted, $\operatorname{vol}(B(v,r)) \leq \operatorname{vol}(V) \leq n^2$. Therefore, by taking logarithm from both sides of the above inequality we get,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \phi(B(v,i)) \le 2\log(\operatorname{vol}(B(v,r))) \le 4\log n.$$

Therefore, there exists i < r such that $\phi(B(v, i)) \leq 4 \log n/r$.

Now, for each $1 \le i \le k$, let $S_i := B(v_i, r_i)$. Since $r_i < \operatorname{diam}(G)/6k$, S_1, \ldots, S_k are disjoint. Furthermore, by the above claim $\phi(S_i) \le 24k \log n / \operatorname{diam}(G)$. Therefore, $\phi_k(G) \le 24k \log n / \operatorname{diam}(G)$. Finally, using Theorem 1.2, we get

$$\lambda_k \le 2\phi_k(G) \le \frac{48k\log n}{\operatorname{diam}(G)}.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

References

[Kal12] Gil Kalai. Personal Communication, 2012. 1

[LOT12] James R. Lee, Shayan Oveis Gharan, and Luca Trevisan. Multi-way spectral partitioning and higher-order cheeger inequalities. In STOC, pages 1117–1130, 2012. 2